

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rydbeck (US 5,590,417) in view of Grube et. al. (US 5,666,661).

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Rydbeck teaches a wireless headset associated with a phone handset for providing hands free communication. Applicant also agrees with the Examiner that Rydbeck fails to teach a communication system with a plurality of access points each coupled to the communication system at one of a plurality of dispersed locations, wherein the access points are capable of selectively establishing a communication path within the communication system between an access point emulating the phone or handset and an access point emulating the headset to provide communication between the phone and the headset when the phone and the headset are separated by a distance greater than the distance limit. The Applicant, however, respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that the latter is taught by Grube and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Grube into the system of Rydbeck to arrive at Applicant's invention.

Applicant asserts that Grube does not teach Applicant's invention. In Applicant's claimed invention the communication mode is normally **directly** between a **headset** and a **handset**. Only when the distance between the headset and handset gets to great does communication over the communication system begin. Also, the communication system is relatively local such as in the case of a Local Area Network. When the headset and the handset communicate over the LAN one access point **emulates** the handset and another **emulates** a headset to facilitate communication between the headset and handset. While Applicant agrees that Grube discloses a communication system with multiple access points, the communication system and access points

are completely different than those taught and claimed by Applicant. The communication system described by Grube is a cellular telephone network with the access points being base stations. Moreover, in Grube there is no communication between a headset and handset but rather communication is accomplished between two handsets. Grube actually teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention in that the intention of Grube is to achieve direct communication between the two handsets and avoid communication over the communication system. Furthermore, the access points never emulate a headset or a handset.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Grube does not teach a communication system with a plurality of access points each coupled to the communication system at one of a plurality of dispersed locations, wherein the access points are capable of selectively establishing a communication path within the communication system between an access point emulating the phone and an access point emulating the headset to provide communication between the phone and the headset when the phone and the headset are separated by a distance greater than the distance limit. Applicant also disagrees that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Grube into the system of Rydbeck in order to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 8, 13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rydbeck (US 5,590,417) in view of Grube et. al. (US 5,666,661) and further in view of Cannon (US 6,650,871).


Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Cannon discloses the use of Bluetooth technology as a protocol for communication. Applicant asserts, however, that Cannon, as with Rydbeck and Grube, does not disclose the emulation of a headset by one access point and the emulation of a handset by another access point in the communication system as claimed by Applicant.

Appl. No. 09/846,073
Amdt. dated 11 June 2004
Reply to Office Action of 11 March 2004

Applicant respectfully asserts that the foregoing places the application in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11 June 04


Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com